

punch and come back strong. The American steel industry is the Rocky Balboa of the global market.

None of us will forget those difficult days 15 years ago when American steel was on the ropes. We had become too content with the status quo and our overseas competitors exploited this. But management and unions worked together and American steel was reborn.

We have seen real and significant growth since then. In my district, Beth Steel cranks out 9,000 to 10,000 tons of quality American steel a day!

That's 9,000 to 10,000 tons of quality steel a day when operating under normal conditions. But these days things are anything but normal. Steel producers in our country are decreasing production, laying off workers, and reporting losses.

I understand that there are serious economic problems around the world—problems that are already affecting us. But we must protect our businesses, our employees and our country first.

The American steel industry has done nothing wrong. It shouldn't pay the price for other countries' mistakes.

I'm proud to be here to stand up for steel and my friends who produce it. This is an industry rich in tradition. This is an industry which literally made this country. From the Golden Gate Bridge to the Alaskan oil pipeline—Baltimore's Beth Steel has been there.

This industry has proved it can take a punch. But it shouldn't have to weather a storm of low blows, which is what this foreign dumping amounts to.

This has nothing to do with protectionism. Insisting that our trading partners adhere to international law and play by the rules is not protectionism. I'd call it something much simpler: it's called fairness.

It's not fair that Beth Steel lost \$23 million in the last quarter because of these low blows. The bill we're here to introduce today would become the referee in a fair fight.

We want the amount of steel imported into the United States to return to the rates we saw last summer when the global steel industry competed on a level playing field.

This industry is being forced to fight with one arm tied behind its back. It's taking a pummeling. Congress should release the other hand.

Pass this bill, let this industry fight fairly and, believe me, Rocky will win another.

INTRODUCTION OF THE UNIVERSITY OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA EQUAL EDUCATIONAL STATUS ACT

HON. ELEANOR HOLMES NORTON

OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 2, 1999

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, today I introduce the University of the District of Columbia Equal Educational Status Act. The University of the District of Columbia (UDC) is the only publicly funded institution of higher education in the District of Columbia. The District, like most large cities, has a large population which requires access to a publicly funded open admissions institution to go to any institution at all.

Under existing law, UDC is, by definition, a Historically Black University that qualifies for Historically Black Colleges and Universities (HBCU) funds because it meets the three salient requirements: (1) UDC was created from colleges established before 1964; (2) it served primarily black people; and (3) it is an accredited institution. Though technically an HBCU, UDC was denied the funding benefits of HBCU status because of a factual error. In the HBCU provision of Title III, UDC is discussed in the same section with Howard University, and it explicitly indicates that the University receives a direct payment from the federal government. This has never been true, and in any case, the District itself no longer receives a federal payment.

The importance of HBCU funding and status is that there is an annual appropriation for HBCUs. I have attempted to get HBCU funding for UDC before. The only reason that UDC has not been included is that no extra funds were available to accompany the request, and the entry of UDC was seen as diminishing the appropriations available for the 103 existing HBCUs. I would remove this impediment by proposing that an amount to be determined from the \$17 million in the President's budget for college bound D.C. students be allotted to UDC. The amount in the President's budget is not based on specific underlying assumptions about the available pool of students to go out-of-state. The \$17 million is sufficient to allow some funds to go to desperately needed technology and infrastructure at the University. This is now possible to satisfy the needs of all our students—those prepared to go out-of-state as well as the larger number of students who will not be able to take advantage of the scholarship proposal.

I support the proposal of Congressman TOM DAVIS, Chair of the Subcommittee on the District of Columbia who, acting on suggestions from District and area business people, is writing a bill for public and private funds to pay the difference between in-state and out-of-state tuition for D.C. residents outside the District. I am pleased that in addition to federal funds, private business in this area is also raising funds for this effort. Mr. Davis' staff and mine have begun working together on a joint UDC-scholarships approach. I have also discussed this idea with Mayor Tony Williams and have asked and gathered his suggestions about how funding for UDC should be targeted. Mayor Williams also supports the UDC-scholarship approach.

Working with the White House, we have been able to secure funds sufficient not only for the scholarship proposal but also for the needs of the majority of D.C. students who could not possibly take advantage of out-of-state opportunities. A scholarship—only approach would leave the largest number of college bound D.C. students stranded with access only to a university severely injured by the fiscal crisis. I am pleased that with adequate funding, there is no reason to ignore the demographics of D.C.'s typical student population in need of public higher education.

Who is the typical college bound D.C. resident? The profile of UDC tells the story. Two-thirds of UDC students work; many are single parents with obligations to young children; many go to college after years in the workforce; others could not afford living expenses away from D.C.; and many can only attend an open admissions university. The Davis pro-

posal was never meant to be, nor could it substitute for, a public university which serves the residents of this city in this city.

UDC funds would not be used for the operations of UDC but would be carefully targeted to urgently needed infrastructure needs that have no hope of finding the needed priority in the D.C. budget for years. The city is constantly being asked why our young people are not being trained for rapidly growing technological jobs in the region but they are left with antiquated computers and other hopelessly out-of-date technology.

Further, deferred maintenance has produced pitiful results, such as elevators that don't work, that are shameful in a public institution. Part of the reason for UDC's condition is that it took an enormously hard hit during the fiscal crisis. Its budget went from \$69,631 million in fiscal year 1994 to \$40,148 million this year, not counting huge reductions that began early in the decade. In the one year since February 1, 1998, the number of full-time faculty has plummeted from 375 to 246, not counting enormous cuts to which the University has been subjected throughout this decade.

The University was forced to close for three months in 1996, a calamity that would have destroyed most colleges and universities. Yet, D.C. residents are voting with their feet and returning to UDC. Despite the University's hardships, entering freshmen enrollment rose dramatically by 70% in only one year, from 661 in fall 1997 to 1125 in fall 1998. Today, the University's enrollment of 5,284 represents, an 11% increase in one year.

Some emphasize the undeniable fact that UDC needs money. Others indicate that District youngsters need increased opportunities for higher education, a truism if ever there was one. However, I told UDC students who visited the Capitol yesterday that it is wrong to pit individual justice against institutional justice. I say the same thing to my colleagues—we must do the right thing and assure that we have a win-win for higher education for our young people in this city.

ON THE DEATH OF VIRGINIA GOV. MILLS GODWIN

HON. HERBERT H. BATEMAN

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 2, 1999

Mr. BATEMAN. Mr. Speaker, today in the borough of Chuckatuck, Mills E. Godwin Jr., a former Governor of Virginia, was laid to rest. He was not just a Governor of Virginia, he was in my view and that of many others, the greatest Governor of the Commonwealth in this century.

Mills Godwin served Virginia in the House of Delegates, in the Senate of Virginia, as Lt. Governor and then from 1966–1970, as Governor for his first term as a Democrat. Later, after sitting out a term, he was elected to a second term as Governor, this time as a Republican. Mills Godwin has the distinction of being the only person twice elected Governor of Virginia in this century, and is the only person elected Governor of a state once as a Democrat and once as a Republican.

The first term of Governor Godwin was a magical time in Virginia. For too long, unrealistic fiscal policies prevented Virginia from investing in its future by elevating the level of

spending for public education, higher education, mental health facilities, transportation and economic development. All this changed under the inspirational leadership of Governor Godwin. A statewide network of two-year community colleges was created during his first term. He led in the successful effort to comprehensively revise the antiquated 1902 Constitution of Virginia, and in doing so made possible prudent fiscal policies that provided limited, responsible use of long-term financing of vitally needed programs that had been barred by the old Constitution.

It is no wonder that Mills Godwin for so many people epitomized responsible conservatism. His life and his work attest to the fact that dramatic progress can be coupled with sound conservatism.

I was privileged to have served in the Senate of Virginia as a newly elected Democrat member during Mills Godwin's first Administration. We came from different factions of the Democrat Party of the 1960s. I served during his second Administration when he was a Republican and I had become a Republican.

My respect for him as Governor, and our friendship, was never affected by our political party affiliation. He was a person of tremendous natural dignity accompanied by a keen sense of humor, untouched by frivolity. No American in my lifetime has surpassed the eloquence of Mills Godwin. He had a magical gift of the language and the ability to communicate a sense of quiet passion for the ideas and values he expounded.

Virginia has lost a great son. Virginia is and should be proud of him and the legacy he leaves behind.

POPE JOHN PAUL II REJOICES AT CROSS-STRAIT TALKS BETWEEN TAIWAN AND CHINA

HON. DONALD M. PAYNE

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 2, 1999

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, on January 11, 1999, Pope John Paul II spoke to all the ambassadors accredited to the Holy See and gave his evaluation of world affairs. The pontiff specifically mentioned that the Holy See "should rejoice at the efforts of the great people of China, in a dialogue undertaken with determination and involving the peoples of both sides of the Strait. The international community and the Holy See in particular—follows the felicitous development with great interest, in the hope of significant progress which, without any doubt, would be beneficial to the whole world."

Indeed, I myself am very happy to see that Taiwan has done its very best in attempting to achieve the goal of peace through a mutual understanding with the Chinese mainland. In his 1996 inaugural speech, President Lee Teng-hui of the Republic of China made it very clear that he is a man of peace and that he would like to embark on a journey of peace to the mainland. On numerous occasions President Lee Teng-hui said he would like to see continuing peace and stability in the Taiwan Strait. Moreover he fervently prayed that Taiwan and the Chinese mainland agree under the principles of democracy, freedom, and equitable distribution of wealth. In fact,

during his January 18, 1999 meeting with some of the members of the International Relations Committee, President Lee reiterated his desire to see rapid progress in the cross-strait relations and extended his welcome to Mr. Wang Daohan, chairman of the Peking-based Association for Relations Across the Taiwan Strait, to visit Taiwan this year.

Mr. Speaker, President Lee Teng-hui ought to be commended for maintaining peace and stability in the Taiwan Strait and for re-starting the cross-strait dialogue between Taiwan and the Chinese mainland. In addition, the pope's speech to the ambassadors on January 11, 1999, especially his reference to Taiwan and the Chinese mainland, was both timely and insightful, fully demonstrating the pontiff's concern for world peace. I submit the text to be printed in the RECORD.

Your Excellencies, Ladies and Gentlemen, I am deeply grateful for the good wishes offered to me on your behalf by your Dean, the Ambassador of the Republic of San Marino, Signor Giovanni Galassi, at the beginning of this final year before the year 2000. They join the many expressions of affection which were sent to me by the Authorities of your countries and by your fellow citizens on the occasion of the twentieth anniversary of my Pontificate and for the New Year. To all, I wish to express once again my profound gratitude.

This yearly ceremony is like a family gathering and for this reason it is particularly dear to me. First, because through you almost all the nations of the world are made present here with their achievements and their hopes, but also with their difficulties. Secondly, because such a meeting affords me the pleasant opportunity to express my fervent and prayerful good wishes for you, your families and your fellow citizens. I ask God to grant each one health, prosperity and peace. You know that you can count on me and my collaborators whenever it is a matter of supporting what each country, with its best efforts, undertakes for the spiritual, moral and cultural uplifting of its citizens and for the advancement of all that contributes to good relations between peoples in justice and peace.

The family of nations, which has recently taken part in the joy of Christmas and with one accord has welcomed the New Year, has without doubt *some grounds for rejoicing*.

In Europe, I think especially of *Ireland* where the agreement signed on Good Friday last has established the basis for a much awaited peace, which must be founded on a stable social life, on mutual trust and the principle of equality before the law for all.

Another reason for satisfaction for all of us is the peace process in *Spain* which for the first time is enabling the peoples of the Basque territories to see the spectre of blind violence retreat and to think seriously of a process of normalization.

The transition to *one currency and the enlargement towards the East* will no doubt give Europe the possibility to become more and more a community with a common destiny, a true "European community"—this is in any case our dearest wish. This obviously presupposes that the member countries are able to reconcile their history with the same common project, so that they may all see themselves as equal partners, concerned only for the common good. The spiritual families which have made such a great contribution to the civilization of this continent—I am thinking especially of Christianity—have a role which seems to me to be more and more decisive. In the face of social problems which keep significant sectors of the population in poverty, and of social inequalities which give rise to chronic instability, and before the

younger generations seeking points of reference in an often chaotic world, it is important that the Churches should be able to proclaim the tenderness of God and the call to fraternity which the recent feast of Christmas has caused to shine out once again for all humanity.

I would like to draw to your attention, ladies and gentlemen, further grounds for satisfaction in relation to the *American Continent*. I am referring to the *agreement reached in Brasilia on 26 October last between Ecuador and Peru*. Thanks to the persevering efforts of the international community—especially on the part of the guarantor countries—two sister nations had the courage to renounce violence, to accept a compromise and to resolve their differences in a peaceful way. This is an example for so many other nations still bogged down in divisions and disagreements. I am firmly convinced that these two nations, thanks particularly to the Christian faith which unites them, will be able to meet the great challenge of fraternity and peace, and thus turn a painful page of their history, which in fact dates from the very beginning of their existence as independent states. I address an urgent and paternal call to the Catholics of Ecuador and Peru to work with conviction for reconciliation through prayer and action, and thus to contribute to ensuring that the peace brought by the treaties enters everyone's heart.

We should also rejoice at the efforts of the *great people of China*, in a dialogue undertaken with determination and involving the people on both sides of the Strait. The international community—and the Holy See in particular—follows this felicitous development with great interest, in the hope of significant progress which, without any doubt, would be beneficial to the whole world.

However, the culture of peace is far from being universal, as the centres of persistent dissension testify.

Not far from us, the *Balkan region* continues to experience a time of great instability. We cannot yet speak of normalization in Bosnia-Herzegovina where the effects of the war are still being felt in inter-ethnic relations, where half the population remains displaced and where social tensions dangerously persist. Again recently, Kosovo has been the scene of deadly confrontations for both ethnic and political reasons which have prevented a peaceful dialogue between the parties and hindered any economic development. Everything must be done to help the people of Kosovo and the Serbs to meet around a table in order to defuse without delay the armed suspicion which paralyses and kills. Albania and Macedonia would be the first to benefit, since in the Balkans all things are closely related. Many other countries, large and small, in *Central and Eastern Europe* are also at the mercy of political and social instability; they are struggling along the road to democracy and have not yet succeeded in living in a market economy capable of giving everyone a legitimate share of well-being and growth.

The peace process undertaken in the Middle East continues to make uneven progress and has not yet brought the local peoples the hope and well-being which they have the right to enjoy. It is not possible to keep people indefinitely between war and peace, without the risk of dangerously increasing tensions and violence. It is not reasonable to put off until later the question of the status of the Holy City of Jerusalem, to which the followers of the three monotheist religions turn their gaze. The parties concerned should face these problems with a keen sense of their responsibilities. The recent crisis in Iraq has shown once more that war does not solve problems. It complicates them, and